

Submitted herewith is a Submission Of Marked Up Claims in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c)(1)(ii).

The objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) is respectfully traversed.

Submitted herewith for approval is a new Figure 4 showing Select A Specific Option Set 252, Exit 290, and Select Filter 266. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the drawings meet the requirements of Rule 1.84(p)(5).

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The objection to the specification because of informalities is respectfully traversed.

Paragraph 29 has been amended to describe workstation 56, and work stations 38, 40, and 42.

Paragraph 40 has been amended to describe a flowchart 200.

Figure 4 has been amended to show Select A Specific Option Set 252.

Paragraph 41 has been amended to describe Peach Bottom 3 plant 326.

Submitted herewith for approval is a new Figure 7 showing All 368.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The provisional rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11-14, 17-22, 24, 25, and 27 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-4, 13, 21, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 37, 40, 41, and 63 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 09/634,434 is respectfully traversed. Claims 1-4, 13, 21, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 37, 40, 41, and 63 have not issued in a U.S. Patent. For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully

request that the provisional double patenting rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11-14, 17-22, 24, 25, and 27 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. (US 5,817,958) in view of Ikeda et al. (US 2001/0056335-A1) is respectfully traversed.

Uchida et al. describe a plant monitoring and diagnosing method that includes detecting and accumulating plant operating conditions, apparatus operating conditions and environment conditions, inputting and accumulating plant inspection data, and monitoring and diagnosing plant conditions based on plant record information including the accumulated detection data and inspection data. The plant record information is stored in the form of a plant chart in which the detection data and the inspection data are compressed and accumulated such as a personal clinical chart, and the plant conditions are diagnosed based on the data in the plant chart. Current plant conditions are predicted in accordance with the data in the plant chart and a plant condition predicting model, and an abnormality in the plant conditions are monitored and diagnosed based on a comparison between the predicted current plant conditions and the current detection data. When an abnormality is detected as a result of diagnosing the plant conditions, an abnormal location and an abnormal item are identified and events which will ensue from the abnormality are predicted. Also, a residual life for each plant component, apparatus and member is evaluated based on the data in the plant chart and material degradation data calculated from the chart data. Uchida et al. do not describe nor suggest modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, and determining the next required inspection of each plant component.

Ikeda et al. describe a remote monitoring diagnostic system that includes a data storage file used to collect plant data representing the operation status of a plant and to store the plant data, a monitoring system to monitor the field plant according to the collected plant data, a database storing the past plant data associated with errors having occurred to the plant and actions taken to cope with the errors. The monitoring system also includes a diagnostic system to analyze the plant data sent to the database, and a reporting system to send a report to the user of the plant regarding the causes for the error and/or actions taken to cope with the error based on the result of the analysis. Ikeda et al. also describe a method that includes monitoring the plant by the plant monitoring system installed in the plant, collecting plant data representing the operation status of the plant, sending information on the occurrence of an error indicated by the plant monitoring system, and the collected plant data associated with the error, to the remote monitoring diagnostic center located away from the plant. The plant data is analyzed at the monitoring and diagnostic center according to the database storing the past plant data associated with errors having occurred and actions taken to cope with those errors. The causes for the error and/or actions taken to cope with the error are reported to the user of the plant based on the result of the analysis. Ikeda et al. do not describe nor suggest modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, and determining the next required inspection of each plant component.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a method for managing inspection requirements that includes receiving information relating to components in a plant, storing the information into the centralized database, cross-referencing the information received, updating the centralized database based on the information received, modifying inspection requirements based on

inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry.

Uchida et al. and Ikeda et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, Uchida et al. and Ikeda et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Uchida et al. and Ikeda et al., alone or in combination.

Claims 3-6, 11, 14, 15, and 17 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claims 3-6, 11, 14, 15, and 17 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-6, 11, 14, 15, and 17 likewise are patentable over Uchida et al. and Ikeda et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 14, 15, and 17 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2, 7-9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. (US 5,817,958) in view of Ikeda et al. (US 2001/0056335-A1) and further in view of Klinvex (US 4,642,215) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Uchida et al. and Ikeda et al., alone or in combination.

Klinvex et al. describe a universal tool for ultrasonic testing of tubular objects such as nuclear reactor vessels. The tool includes an array of transducers mounted in groups for

common inspection of a particular weld volume. The individual transducers, as well as the groups, are arranged in a compact assembly for minimizing the overall dimensions of the tool and its corresponding weight. The transducers are arranged in a manner which permits inspection of tubular objects having different radii of curvature and corresponding different diameters with a single tool without the need of having to individually adjust the orientation angles of the transducers. Klinvex et al. do not describe nor suggest a method for managing inspection requirements that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry.

Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination.

Claims 2, 7-9, and 16 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claims 2, 7-9, and 16 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 7-9, and 16 likewise are patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 2, 7-9, and 16 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 12, 13, 18-20, 22, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. (US 5,817,958) in view of Ikeda et al. (US 2001/0056335-A1) and further in view of Eryurek et al. (US 2002/0123864-A1) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Uchida et al. and Ikeda et al., alone or in combination.

Eryurek et al. describe a system and method for analyzing a process that includes collecting process data within a process control plant, transmitting the collected process data to a remote data processing facility, analyzing the process data within the remote data processing facility to generate analysis data using one of a plurality asset or process analysis tools stored within a database of the remote data processing facility, and transmitting the analysis data to the process control plant. Eryurek et al. do not describe nor suggest a method for managing inspection requirements that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry.

Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination.

Claims 12 and 13 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claims 12 and 13 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and 13 likewise are patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination.

Claim 18 of the present application recites a network-based system for managing inspection requirements that includes a client system comprising a browser, a data storage device for storing information, and a server system configured to be coupled to the client system and the database. The server system is further configured to receive information relating to inspection of components of a specific plant, store the information into a centralized database, update the centralized database based on the information received, modify inspection requirements based upon inspection result information, determine next required inspection of each plant component, cross-reference the information received against the components, and provide information in response to an inquiry.

Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a network-based system for managing inspection requirements as recited in Claim 18. Particularly, and as explained above, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a server system is configured to modify inspection requirements based upon inspection result information, determine the next required inspection of each plant component, cross-reference the information received against the components, and provide information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 18 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination.

Claims 19-20, 22, and 24-27 depend from independent Claim 18. When the recitations of dependent Claims 19-20, 22, and 24-27 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 19-20, 22, and 24-27 likewise are patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 12, 13, 18-20, 22, and 24-27 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. (US 5,817,958) in view of Ikeda et al. (US 2001/0056335-A1) and of Eryurek et al. (US 2002/0123864-A1) and further in view of Klinvex et al. (US 4,642,215) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a server system is configured to modify inspection requirements based upon inspection result information, determine the next required inspection of each plant component, cross-reference the information received against the components, and provide information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 18 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Eryurek et al., alone or in combination.

Klinvex et al. do not describe nor suggest a server system configured to modify inspection requirements based upon inspection result information, to determine the next required inspection of each plant component, to cross-reference the information received against the components, and to provide information in response to an inquiry. Rather, Klinvex et al. describe a universal tool for ultrasonic testing of tubular objects such as nuclear reactor vessels.

Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Eryurek et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a network-based system for managing inspection requirements as recited in Claim 18. Particularly, and as explained above, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Eryurek et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a server system is configured to modify inspection requirements based upon inspection result information, determine the next required inspection of each plant component, cross-reference the information received against the components, and provide information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 18 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Eryurek et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination.

Claims 21 and 23 depend from independent Claim 18. When the recitations of dependent Claims 21 and 23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21 and 23 likewise are patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Eryurek et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 21 and 23 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 10 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. (US 5,817,958) in view of Ikeda et al. (US 2001/0056335-A1) and Klinvex (US 4,642,215) and further in view of JP Patent No. 11-345019 to Uchida et al. (JP-Uchida) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of

each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., and Klinvex et al., alone or in combination.

JP-Uchida describes a maintenance supporting device for a plant that includes a holding part for holding data related to the plant, a condition setting part for setting the long-term maintenance schedule and a suitable condition computing part for computing suitable maintenance conditions. The suitable computing part includes an inspection day's schedule computing part for setting a periodic inspection day's schedule based on the operation data and the maintenance schedule. JP-Uchida does not describe nor suggest a method that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry. Rather, JP-Uchida describes that the periodic-check schedule is based on the performance data and the maintenance program set as the conditioning section (see paragraph [0008]). Also, JP-Uchida describes at paragraph [0009] that "according to this invention a periodic-check schedule can be set up by the inspection schedule operation part of compatibility-conditions operation part and the repair schedule of the device which constitutes a plant by the repair schedule operation part of compatibility-conditions operation part can be set up, the long-term conditions of a plant are establishable".

Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method that includes modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information, determining

the next required inspection of each plant component, and providing information in response to an inquiry.

Further, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of Uchida et al. and the teachings of Ikeda et al. and the teachings of Klinvex et al. and the teachings of JP-Uchida because there is no motivation to do so other than the teachings of Applicants' application. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestions or incentive supporting the combination. In addition, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Office Action, at page 7, suggest that "it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Uchida to include a corresponding method and system for sending data to a central location, as taught by Ikeda, because, as suggested by Ikeda, the combination would have provided a method for monitoring a plurality of plants from one location". Applicants submit that Uchida is directed to a monitoring and diagnosing method and system for a single plant. There is no indication, in Uchida, of the need to monitor more than one plant at a time or that the described method and system is capable of monitoring and

diagnosing more than one plant at a time. Applicants submit that the motivation to combine the cited art came from Applicants own application.

Further, the Office Action, at page 10, suggests that "it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Uchida and Ikeda to include a method for performing the weld inspection and specifying that the data correspond to inspection regulations or recommendations, as taught by Klinvex, because the combination would have provided the means necessary to test the reactor welds". Applicants respectfully submit that Klinvex does not describe nor suggest any method for performing weld inspections. Rather, Klinvex only describes an ultrasonic testing tool. Further, Uchida and Ikeda are not limited to the monitoring of weld integrity and there is no shown motivation to combine the teachings of Klinvex with the teachings of Uchida and Ikeda. Applicants submit that the only motivation to combine the teachings of Klinvex with the teachings of Uchida and Ikeda is provided by Applicants own application.

Further, the Office Action , at page 13, suggests that "it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Uchida, Ikeda, and Klinvex to include modifying or generating inspection requirements based on inspection results, as taught by JP-Uchida, because, as suggested by JP-Uchida, the combination would have provided a method for determining a future (i.e. long term) maintenance schedule". Applicants respectfully submit that JP-Uchida does not describe nor suggest generating inspection requirements based on inspection results. Rather, JP-Uchida describes that the periodic-check schedule is based on the performance data and the maintenance program set as the conditioning section. Also, there is no indication, in Uchida, Ikeda, or Klinvex of a need for determining a long term maintenance schedule.

Applicants submit that the motivation to combine the cited art came from Applicants own application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination.

Claim 10 has been canceled.

Claim 28 of the present application recites a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium for managing inspection requirements. The program includes a code segment that receives information relating to components including inspection regulations and inspection results, a code segment that maintains a database by adding, deleting and updating information relating to components, a code segment that generates inspection requirements based on the information relating to components, a code segment that determines next required inspection of each plant component, and a code segment that provides information to be displayed on a user system.

Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method as recited in Claim 28. Particularly, and as explained above, Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a computer program that includes a code segment that generates inspection requirements based on the information relating to components, a code segment that determines next required inspection of each plant component, and a code segment that provides information to be displayed on a user system. Also, as explained above, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of Uchida et al. and the teachings of Ikeda et al. and the teachings of Klinvex et al. and the teachings of JP-Uchida because there is no motivation to do so other than the teachings of Applicants' application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that

Claim 28 is patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination.

Claims 29-31 depend from independent Claim 28. When the recitations of dependent Claims 29-31 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 28, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29-31 likewise are patentable over Uchida et al., Ikeda et al., Klinvex et al., and JP-Uchida, alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 10 and 28-31 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Tersillo", written over a horizontal line.

Michael Tersillo
Registration No. 42,180
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070

24-NS-6032
PATENT**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Stark et al.	:	
	:	Art Unit: 2857
Serial No.: 09/682,030	:	
	:	Examiner: J. West
Filed: July 11, 2001	:	
	:	
For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR	:	
MANAGING INSPECTIONS	:	

SUBMISSION OF MARKED UP PARAGRAPHS AND CLAIMS

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

A marked-up version of amended paragraphs 20, 40, and 41, and amended Claims 1, 5, 12, 18, and 28, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c)(1)(ii), follows below.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

Please replace paragraph 20 with the following replacement paragraph 20.

[0020] In the exemplary embodiment, any authorized individual or an employee of the business entity having a workstation 54 can access the Inspection Management System (IMS). One of the client systems includes a senior manager's workstation 56 located at a remote location. Workstations 54 and 56 are personal computers having a web browser. Also, workstations 54 and 56 are configured to communicate with server system 12. In one embodiment, users access the customer dashboard application through a web site utilizing one of workstation 54 and 56. Workstations 54 and 56 include a network-browser, for example, Netscape® by Netscape Communications Corporation, or Internet Explorer® by Microsoft Corporation. In one embodiment, the network-browser is one of Internet Explorer® 4.0 (or higher), or Netscape Navigator® 4.0 (or higher). Furthermore, fax server 28 communicates with employees located outside the business entity's 44 and any of the remotely located client [systems] workstations,

including a client [system] workstation 56 via a telephone link. Fax server 28 is configured to communicate with other client [systems] workstations 38, 40, and 42 as well.

Please replace paragraph 40 with the following replacement paragraph 40.

[0040] Figure 4 is [an] a flowchart 200 of the processes used by system 10 to facilitate use. Initially, the user accesses 210 a user interface 220 of the web site through client system 14 (shown in Figure 1). In one embodiment, client system 14, as well as server system 12, are protected from access by unauthorized individuals. The user can be required to log-in to system 10 using a password (not shown) or an employee payroll number for security. User interface 220 displays several options 250 available to the user through various links. Once the user selects 252 a specific plant and information option set (historical or future) from the various links, the request is transmitted to server system 12. Transmitting the request 260 is accomplished either by click of a mouse or by a voice command. Once server system 12 (shown in Figure 1) receives 262 the request, server system 12 displays 264 the filter pull-down lists to the user relating to the plant and information option selected. The user selects 266 the desired filters and transmits the request 268. Server system 12 receives the request 270 and accesses 272 database server 16 to retrieve requested information 274 from database 20 (shown in Figure 1). The requested information is downloaded 280 and provided 282 to client system 14 from server 12. The user continues to search database 20 for other information or exits 290 from IMS 10.

Please replace paragraph 41 with the following replacement paragraph 41.

[0041] Figure 5 is an exemplary embodiment of a user interface 300 displaying a home page of Inspection Management System (IMS) 10 (shown in Figure 2). In one exemplary

embodiment, user interface 300 displays different alternative plants to a user through various links. These linkages include a link to Dresden 2 plant 310, a link to Dresden 3 plant 312, a link to LaSalle 1 plant 314, a link to LaSalle 2 plant 316, a link to Quad Cities 1 plant 318, a link to Quad Cities 2 plant 320, a link to Clinton plant 322, a link to Peach Bottom 2 plant 324, a link to Peach Bottom [1] 3 plant 326, a link to Limerick 1 plant 328, a link to Limerick 2 plant 330, and a link to Oyster Creek plant 332. User interface 300, also known as an Inspection Management System's home page, is linked to database 20. Database 20 is often referred to as the Inspection management database or the database. Home Page 300 is the entry point for anyone trying to access Inspection Management Database 20 via the web. The first step in accessing information is to select an option listed on Home Page 300 and to indicate that selection by clicking the selected link. Additionally, Home Page 300 facilitates the selection of Historical Data or Future Required Exam data. A "Historical " button 334 and a "Next Required Exam" button 336 are provided. Selection of the desired button 334 or 336 after selection of the desired plant system 10 downloads and provides the next interface.

IN THE CLAIMS

Please cancel Claim 10.

1. (amended) A method for managing inspection requirements using a network-based system including a server system coupled to a centralized database and at least one client system, said method comprising:

receiving information relating to components in a plant;

storing the information into the centralized database;

cross-referencing the information received;

updating the centralized database based on the information received; [and]
modifying inspection requirements based on inspection result information;
determining next required inspection of each plant component; and
providing information in response to an inquiry.

5. (amended) A method in accordance with Claim 1 wherein receiving information comprises the receiving data for at least one of a plurality of plants [a Dresden 2 plant, a Dresden 3 plant, a LaSalle 1 plant, a LaSalle 2 plant, a Quad Cities 1 plant, and a Quad Cities 2 plant, a Clinton plant, a Peach Bottom 2 plant, a Peach Bottom 1 plant, a Limerick 1 plant, a Limerick 2 plant, and a Oyster Creek plant].

12. (amended) A method in accordance with Claim 1 wherein providing information comprises:

displaying information on the client system identifying at least one of an option relating to at least one of a plurality of plants [a Dresden 2 plant, a Dresden 3 plant, a LaSalle 1 plant, a LaSalle 2 plant, a Quad Cities 1 plant, and a Quad Cities 2 plant, a Clinton plant, a Peach Bottom 2 plant, a Peach Bottom 1 plant, a Limerick 1 plant, a Limerick 2 plant, and a Oyster Creek plant]; and

receiving an inquiry from the client system regarding at least one of an option relating to at least one of a plurality of plants [a Dresden 2 plant, a Dresden 3 plant, a LaSalle 1 plant, a LaSalle 2 plant, a Quad Cities 1 plant, and a Quad Cities 2 plant, a Clinton plant, a Peach Bottom 2 plant, a Peach Bottom 1 plant, a Limerick 1 plant, a Limerick 2 plant, and a Oyster Creek plant].

18. (amended) A network-based system for managing inspection requirements, said system comprising:

a client system comprising a browser;

a data storage device for storing information;

a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and said database, said server system further configured to:

receive information relating to inspection of components of a specific plant;

store the information into a centralized database;

update the centralized database based on the information received;

modify inspection requirements based upon inspection result information;

determine next required inspection of each plant component;

cross-reference the information received against the components; and

provide information in response to an inquiry.

28. (amended) A computer program embodied on a computer readable medium for managing inspection requirements, said program comprising:

a code segment that receives information relating to components including inspection regulations and inspection results [and then:]

a code segment that maintains a database by adding, deleting and updating information relating to components;

a code segment that generates inspection requirements based on the information relating to components; [and]

a code segment that determines next required inspection of each plant component; and

a code segment that provides information to be displayed on a user system.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Tersillo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

Michael Tersillo
Registration No. 42,180
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070